

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:	Slupesky et al.		
SERIAL NO.:	10/733,559	Group Art Unit:	2168
FILING DATE:	December 11, 2003	Examiner:	Ly, Cheyne D.
FOR:	<b>Dynamic Command Line User Interface</b>		

**Response to Examiner Interview Summary**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Examiner Interview Summary dated April 23, 2009, Applicants hereby submit a summary of the interview.

A telephone interview took place for the subject application on April 22, 2009 with Examiner Ly and Applicants' Attorney. Applicants' Attorney hereby submits a summary of the interview. There was no exhibit or demonstration of the invention provided during the course of this interview. The interview focused on a proposed amendment to the claims submitted by Applicants' Attorney prior to the interview. More specifically, an explanation of the invention was provided by Applicants' Attorney, together with a highlight of where the differences lie between the subject claims and the prior art of record. It was agreed that the proposed amendment to the claims overcomes the rejection set forth under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. However, an agreement pertaining to the prior art rejection was not reached.

Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the Examiner's Interview Summary in compliance with MPEP §713.04. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,  
By: /Rochelle Lieberman/  
Rochelle Lieberman  
Registration No. 39,276  
Attorney for Applicants

Lieberman & Brandsdorfer, LLC  
802 Still Creek Lane  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878  
Phone: (301) 948-7775  
Fax: (301) 948-7774  
Email: [rocky@legalplanner.com](mailto:rocky@legalplanner.com)  
Date: May 26, 2009